

REMARKS

Applicants thanks the Examiner for consideration given the present application. Claims 1-41 are currently pending. Claims 22, 24, 33, 40 and 41 and the specification have been amended through this response. Claims 1, 16, 22-24, 33, 40 and 41 are independent. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejected claims in light of the amendment and remarks presented herein and earnestly seek timely allowance of all pending claims.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §101

The Office Action rejects claims 22, 23, 40 and 41 under 35 U.S.C. §101. The first paragraph at the top of page 41 of the specification has been deleted and claims 22 and 40 have been amended to recite “computer readable medium storing a program” to obviate the rejection. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Claims Define Patentable Subject Matter

The Office Action rejects claims 1-9, 11-13 and 16-23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over European Patent Publication No. EP 1 158 485 to Okada, et al. (Okada) in view of European Patent Publication No. EP 0 883 103 to Chikazawa; rejects claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Okada in view of Chikazawa and further in view of European Patent Publication No. EP 0 907 158 to Izumi, et al. (Izumi); rejects claims 14 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Okada in view of Chikazawa and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,475,399 to Borsuk; and rejects claims 24-41 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Okada in view of Borsuk. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, “the control section sets a luminance level of the basic portion and a luminance level of the neighboring portion in accordance with the intensity of light for irradiating the display screen.” Independent claims 16, 22 and 23 recite, *inter alia*, “setting a luminance level of the basic portion and a luminance level of the neighboring portion

in accordance with the luminance level of light for irradiating the display screen.” The applied references fail to teach or suggest the recited features of independent claims 1, 16, 22, and 24.

Okada discloses a display device 3 that includes a plurality of pixels 12 where each of the pixels 12 includes a plurality of sub-pixels. Each pixel 12 includes three sub-pixels 14R, 14G and 14B. Text data 26 and bit map data 25A may be input to the control section 20 through a communication line. A CPU controls and monitors a graphic display apparatus and executes the graphic display program stored in the auxiliary storage apparatus. See paragraphs [0093], [0120] and [0124] of Okada.

The Office Action acknowledges that Okada does not disclose setting a luminance level in accordance with the intensity of light for irradiating the display screen. However the Office Action alleges that Chikazawa cures the deficiencies of Okada.

Chikazawa discloses an LCD that modifies its intensity based on the intensity of ambient light. See column 1, lines 1-22 of Chikazawa. The LCD includes a sensor 40 connected to a control input 22₁ of the intensity control circuit 22, which detects the intensity of the ambient light. The tables in the circuit 32 or 42 provide a correction which maintains the colors when the intensity of the ambient light or the intensity of the back source is changing. See column 3, lines 1-46 of Chikazawa. The luminance level of Chikazawa is set using a sensor. The present invention does not require the use of a sensor to set the luminance level. Borsuk and Izumi fails to cure the deficiencies of Okada and Chikazawa. Thus, the applied references, alone or in any combination fail to teach or suggest the recited features of independent claims 1, 16, 22 and 23.

Claim 24 recites, *inter alia*, “the control section sets a luminance level of the basic portion and a luminance level of the neighboring portion in accordance with information related to a viewer of the display device to give the appearance that the displayed characters have more thickness.” Independent claims 33, 40 and 41 recite, *inter alia*, “setting a luminance level of the basic portion and a luminance level of the neighboring portion in accordance with information related to a viewer of the display screen to give the appearance that the displayed characters

have more thickness.” The applied references fail to teach or suggest the recited features of independent claims 24, 33, 40 and 41.

The Office Action acknowledges that Okada does not disclose setting the luminance level in accordance with information related to a viewer of the display device. However, the Office Action relies on Borsuk to cure the deficiencies of Okada.

However, Borsuk discloses a display device that only accounts for users with different eyesights by varying font sizes of the displayed characters and not luminance levels. See col. 3, lines 56-65 and col. 8, lines 1-3 of Borsuk.

The present invention accounts for users with different eyesights by varying the luminance levels of the display to give the appearance that the displayed character have more thickness. See page 73, lines 3-12, page 78, lines 18-24 and page 79, lines 1-5 of the specification. Chikazawa and Izumi fail to cure the deficiencies of Okada and Borsuk. Thus, the applied references, alone or in any combination, fail to teach or suggest the recited features of independent claims 24, 33, 40 and 41.

For at least the reasons stated above, independent claims 1, 16, 22-24, 33, 40 and 41 are patentably distinct from the applied references. The dependent claims are at least allowable by virtue of their dependence on corresponding allowable independent claims 1, 16, 22-24, 33, 40 and 41.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of the claims based on the applied references is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Application No. 10/521,448
Amendment dated October 1, 2008
Reply to Office Action of July 1, 2008

Docket No.: 0717-0537PUS1

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Obert H. Chu Reg. No. 52,744 at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.147; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: October 1, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Michael R. Cammarata

Registration No.: 39,491

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant